

Message

From: Walker, Stuart [Walker.Stuart@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/5/2021 2:09:04 AM
To: Buxbaum, David [Buxbaum.David@epa.gov]; Openchowski, Charles [openchowski.charles@epa.gov]
CC: Brock, Martha [Brock.Martha@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: cheat sheet for Oak Ridge risk based discharge limits

222.3 is from a R4 run. Turns out they were making runs in an excel spreadsheet to simulate the PRG calculator, with some minor differences. The 297 is from a run I did with the PRG calculator. I'll forward an email I sent to R4 program last week, which I just told them this afternoon to send to DOE when we had a conf call, which has a word file which is a table of all of the R4 old CWA runs and my CWA runs this summer.

Stuart Walker
US EPA/OLEM/OSRTI/ARD/SPB
Superfund Remedial Program's National Radiation Expert
Phone work: 1-703-603-8748 (current number)
Phone work: 1-202-566-1148 (this will be my new number on October 22)
Phone cell: 1-202-262-9986
Email: walker.stuart@epa.gov

From: Buxbaum, David <Buxbaum.David@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 5:06 PM
To: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Openchowski, Charles <openchowski.charles@epa.gov>
Cc: Brock, Martha <Brock.Martha@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: cheat sheet for Oak Ridge risk based discharge limits

Stuart – For Tc-99 there is a reference to 222.3 pCi/L in one table but 297 in another table as AWQC equivalents – can you explain since they both seem based on CWA default exposure factors. Thanks

David M. Buxbaum, Senior Attorney
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4, Office of Regional Counsel
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth St. S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30303
Phone: 404 562-9549(currently not monitored) Fax: 404 562-9486
Work Cell (470) 382-9449

NOTICE: ENFORCEMENT CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED. This message is being sent by, or on behalf of, an attorney. It is intended exclusively for the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy, or disseminate this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of this message.

From: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 3:38 PM
To: Openchowski, Charles <openchowski.charles@epa.gov>; Buxbaum, David <Buxbaum.David@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: cheat sheet for Oak Ridge risk based discharge limits
Importance: High

Per our discussion

Stuart Walker
US EPA/OLEM/OSRTI/ARD/SPB
Superfund Remedial Program's National Radiation Expert
Phone work: 1-703-603-8748 (current number)
Phone work: 1-202-566-1148 (this will be my new number on October 22)
Phone cell: 1-202-262-9986
Email: walker.stuart@epa.gov

From: Walker, Stuart
Sent: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 12:21 PM
To: Waterhouse, Carlton <Waterhouse.Carlton@epa.gov>; Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>
Cc: Goldberg, Ruby <Goldberg.Ruby@epa.gov>; Hilosky, Nick <Hilosky.Nick@epa.gov>
Subject: cheat sheet for Oak Ridge risk based discharge limits
Importance: High

Hello Carlton and Barry,

Per your request from our discussion on July 30, I am attaching a cheat sheet on the Oak Ridge risk assessment regarding discharge limits into Bear Creek. I have broken the cheat sheet into 2 parts:

1. **Issues with DOE Discharge Limits in 2021 FS Appendix K** – explains how DOE came up with proposed discharge limits in the Focused FS and why their approach is incorrect for complying with the Clean Water Act's Water Quality-Based Effluent Levels (WQBELs) as an ARAR at Bear Creek.
2. **Instructions for DOE** – provides an explanation on how DOE should develop WBELs and discharge limits for Bear Creek.
 - a. **Approach** - Describes the general procedure DOE should be taking.
 - b. **Methods** – Describes the input parameters DOE should be using when running the EPA PRG calculator when developing WBELs.
 - c. **Results** – Provides a table of WQBEL and discharge limits I developed using the CWA methodology with the EPA PRG calculator. The table assumes that DOE does not conduct a fish consumption study to support revising the default fish consumption rate with site-specific information.

Please let me know if you have any comments or questions.